arXiv:1602.02301v1 [math.LO] 6 Feb 2016

CLASSICAL THEOREMS IN THE IMPLICATIONAL PROPOSITIONAL CALCULUS

P.L. ROBINSON

Abstract. For formulas of the Implicational Propositional Calculus (IPC) that are theorems of the classical Propositional Calculus (PC) we show that PC proofs yield IPC proofs. As a consequence, completeness of PC yields completeness of IPC.

1. Theorem

Consider the following natural question regarding the relationship between PC (the classical Propositional Calculus) and IPC (the Implicational Propositional Calculus): let X and Y be well-formed formulas of IPC and assume that there exists a deduction of Y from X within PC; does it follow that there exists a deduction of Y from X within IPC itself?

To be specific, we follow the approach to PC taken by Church [1]: the set of propositional variables is augmented by a propositional constant $\mathfrak{f}$ for falsity; the conditional $\supset$ is the only primitive connective and Modus Ponens is the only inference rule; and there are three axiom schemes, namely

(#1) $A \supset (B \supset A)$
(#2) $[A \supset (B \supset C)] \supset [(A \supset B) \supset (A \supset C)]$
(~~) $[(A \supset \mathfrak{f}) \supset \mathfrak{f}] \supset A$.

For IPC we follow Robbin [2] in modifying the foregoing specifications: the propositional constant $\mathfrak{f}$ is removed completely; and the double negation axiom scheme (~~) is replaced by the Peirce axiom scheme

($\mathbb{P}$) $[(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A$.

We write K for the set comprising all PC formulas and L for the set comprising all IPC formulas; thus, $L \subset K$. We also use K and L to indicate the corresponding systems: thus, $X \vdash_K Y$ indicates the existence of a deduction of Y from X within PC while $\vdash_L Z$ indicates that Z is a theorem of IPC. Lastly, we use $\equiv$ to indicate IPC equivalence: $X \equiv Y$ precisely when $X \vdash_L Y$ and $Y \vdash_L X$.

In these terms, our opening question is as follows: let X and Y be formulas in L; does $X \vdash_K Y$ imply $X \vdash_L Y$?

Of course, the answer to this question is in the affirmative. One argument in support of this answer may be presented in three steps. Step (1): $X \vdash_K Y$ implies $\vdash_K X \supset Y$ by the Deduction Theorem (DT). Step (2): The PC theorem $X \supset Y$ is a tautology by the soundness of PC; so $X \supset Y$ is an IPC theorem by the completeness of IPC. Step (3): $\vdash_L X \supset Y$ implies $X \vdash_L Y$ by Modus Ponens (MP).

Our main purpose here is to present a theorem that facilitates an alternative argument and has an attractive by-product. Let $T(K)$ denote the set comprising all PC theorems and $T(L)$ the set comprising all IPC theorems.

Theorem 0. $T(L) = L \cap T(K)$.

Our proof of this theorem is given in the next section; in principle, when $Z \in L$ has a PC proof, we show that this may be converted into an IPC proof of Z.

An alternative argument supporting the affirmative answer to our opening question is now immediate: if $X \in L$ and $Y \in L$ then $X \supset Y \in L$ so that $\vdash_K X \supset Y$ implies $\vdash_L X \supset Y$ by Theorem 0; this replaces Step (2) of our earlier argument, while Step (1) and Step (3) remain unchanged.

As a pleasing by-product, we may add to a growing list of proofs that the Implicational Propositional Calculus is complete (see [3] and references therein) by deducing completeness of IPC from completeness of PC: indeed, if $Z \in L$ is a tautology then $Z \in T(K)$ by completeness of PC so that $Z \in T(L)$ by Theorem 0.

2. Proof

We begin with some general remarks. The axiom schemes (#1) and (#2) are common to PC and IPC; these axiom schemes suffice for the Deduction Theorem (DT) as a derived inference rule: in both systems, if Γ is a set of formulas then $\Gamma \cup \{A\} \vdash B$ implies $\Gamma \vdash A \supset B$. A routine consequence is Hypothetical Syllogism (HS) in both systems: $A \supset B, B \supset C \vdash A \supset C$.

Further, the Peirce axiom scheme ($\mathbb{P}$) of IPC is a theorem scheme in PC: we may verify this as follows. Let $A, B \in K$ be PC formulas. First, $\mathfrak{f} \vdash_K B$ because $\mathfrak{f} \vdash_K (B \supset \mathfrak{f}) \supset \mathfrak{f}$ by (#1) and $(B \supset \mathfrak{f}) \supset \mathfrak{f} \vdash_K B$ by ($\sim\sim$). By MP and DT it follows that $A \supset \mathfrak{f} \vdash_K A \supset B$. Two successive applications of MP yield $(A \supset B) \supset A, A \supset \mathfrak{f} \vdash_K \mathfrak{f}$ whence DT yields $(A \supset B) \supset A \vdash_K (A \supset \mathfrak{f}) \supset \mathfrak{f}$. Finally, ($\sim\sim$) yields $(A \supset B) \supset A \vdash_K A$ and DT yields $\vdash_K [(A \supset B) \supset A] \supset A$.

We now recall a technical device familiar from the theory of IPC. Let $Q \in L$ be a fixed IPC formula; a precise choice will be made later, but for the time being this formula is arbitrary. For each IPC formula $Z \in L$ we write $QZ := Q(Z) := Z \supset Q$; iteration produces $QQZ = (Z \supset Q) \supset Q$. We shall require several properties of this device in our proof of Theorem 0.

Theorem 1. *If $Z \in L$ is an IPC formula and $Q \vdash_L Z$ then $QQZ \vdash_L Z$.*

Proof. As DT yields $\vdash_L Q \supset Z$ and MP yields $(Z \supset Q) \supset Q, Z \supset Q \vdash_L Q$ it follows that $(Z \supset Q) \supset Q, Z \supset Q \vdash_L Z$ by MP again whence $(Z \supset Q) \supset Q \vdash_L (Z \supset Q) \supset Z$ by DT again. As $\vdash_L [(Z \supset Q) \supset Z] \supset Z$ is an instance of ($\mathbb{P}$), a final application of MP yields $(Z \supset Q) \supset Q \vdash Z$. □

Note that $Z \vdash_L QQZ$ in any case: $Z, Z \supset Q \vdash_L Q$ by MP so $Z \vdash_L (Z \supset Q) \supset Q$ by DT.

Theorem 2. *If $X \in L$ and $Y \in L$ are IPC formulas then $QQ(X \supset Y) \vdash_L QQX \supset QQY$.*

Proof. Note that $QY, X \supset Y \vdash_L QX$ by HS whence $QQX, QY, X \supset Y \vdash Q$ by MP and therefore $QQX, QY \vdash_L Q(X \supset Y)$ by DT. Thus $QQ(X \supset Y), QQX, QY \vdash_L Q$ by MP and so two applications of DT conclude the proof. □

This deduction did not use the Peirce axiom scheme; the next deduction uses it.

Theorem 3. *If $X \in L$ and $Y \in L$ are IPC formulas then $QQX \supset QQY \vdash_L QQ(X \supset Y)$.*

Proof. On the one hand, $Q(X \supset Y) \vdash_L QQX$: indeed, $QX, Q \supset Y \vdash_L X \supset Y$ by HS so that $Q(X \supset Y), QX, Q \supset Y \vdash_L Q$ by MP and $Q(X \supset Y), QX \vdash_L (Q \supset Y) \supset Q$ by DT while $[(Q \supset Y) \supset Q] \supset Q$ is an instance of ($\mathbb{P}$); now $Q(X \supset Y), QX \vdash_L Q$ by MP and we apply DT. On the other hand, $Q(X \supset Y) \vdash_L QY$: in fact, $Y \vdash_L X \supset Y$ from (#1) so that $(X \supset Y) \supset Q, Y \vdash_L Q$ by MP; now apply DT. As $Q(X \supset Y)$ yields QQX and QY it follows that $QQX \supset QQY, Q(X \supset Y) \vdash_L Q$ by MP twice and then DT concludes the proof. □

By definition, the degree of a formula is the number of conditionals in its formation. Now, when $Z \in K$ we define $\phi(Z) \in L$ by induction on degree as follows. If Z has degree zero then Z is either the constant $\mathfrak{f}$ or a variable p; we define $\phi(\mathfrak{f}) = Q$ and $\phi(p) = QQp$. If Z has positive degree then $Z = X \supset Y$ for unique X and Y in K of lesser degree; we define $\phi(Z) = \phi(X) \supset \phi(Y)$. This map $\phi : K \to L$ has a number of properties, among which we draw attention to two.

Theorem 4. *If $Z \in K$ then $Q \vdash_L \phi(Z)$.*

Proof. By induction on degree, of course. The case of zero degree is clear: $Q \vdash_L Q$ is immediate, while the deduction $Q \vdash_L Qp \supset Q$ follows from an instance of (#1) by MP. For the case of positive degree, note that if $Q \vdash_L \phi(Y)$ then $Q \vdash_L \phi(X) \supset \phi(Y)$ results from the instance $\vdash_L \phi(Y) \supset (\phi(X) \supset \phi(Y))$ of (#1) by MP. □

Had we simply defined $\phi(p) = p$ when p is a propositional variable, this claim would fail.

Theorem 5. *If $Z \in L$ then $\phi(Z) \equiv QQZ$.*

Proof. An IPC formula of zero degree is a variable p, for which $\phi(p) = QQp$ by definition. Consider an IPC formula $Z = X \supset Y$ of positive degree: inductively, $\phi(X) \equiv QQX$ and $\phi(Y) \equiv QQY$; Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 now yield

$$\phi(Z) := \phi(X) \supset \phi(Y) \equiv QQX \supset QQY \equiv QQ(X \supset Y) = QQZ.$$

□

Incidentally, recall [1] that the negation of the PC formula $Z \in K$ is given by $\sim Z := Z \supset \mathfrak{f}$. The map ϕ brings out the rôle of $Q(\cdot)$ as a partial negation: if $Z \in K$ then

$$\phi(\sim Z) = \phi(Z \supset \mathfrak{f}) = \phi(Z) \supset \phi(\mathfrak{f}) = \phi(Z) \supset Q = Q\phi(Z).$$

We are now prepared to prove our main theorem, which we restate for convenience.

Theorem 0. $T(L) = L \cap T(K)$.

Proof. The inclusion $T(L) \subseteq L \cap T(K)$ is clear: a proof in IPC yields a proof in PC once each application of the axiom scheme ($\mathbb{P}$) of IPC is replaced by the (proof of the) corresponding theorem scheme in PC.

Now let $Z \in L \cap T(K)$: say the sequence $Z_0, Z_1, \ldots, Z_N = Z$ of PC formulas constitutes a PC proof. Consider the following sequence $\mathcal{S}$ of IPC formulas:

$$\phi(Z_0), \phi(Z_1), \ldots, \phi(Z_N) = \phi(Z).$$

If $Z_n = X \supset (Y \supset X)$ is an instance of scheme (#1) in K then $\phi(Z_n) = \phi(X) \supset (\phi(Y) \supset \phi(X))$ is an instance of (#1) in L; likewise, if Z_n is an instance of scheme (#2) in K then $\phi(Z_n)$ is an instance of (#2) in L. If $Z_n = [(W \supset \mathfrak{f}) \supset \mathfrak{f}] \supset W$ is an instance of the double negation scheme (∼∼) then $\phi(Z_n) = QQ\phi(W) \supset \phi(W)$ is a theorem of IPC on account of Theorem 1 and Theorem 4. If Z_n follows from earlier terms Z_m and $Z_\ell = Z_m \supset Z_n$ by MP then $\phi(Z_n)$ follows from $\phi(Z_m)$ and $\phi(Z_\ell) = \phi(Z_m) \supset \phi(Z_n)$ by MP. Thus the sequence $\mathcal{S}$ furnishes an IPC proof of $\phi(Z)$. Half of Theorem 5 informs us that $\phi(Z) \vdash_L QQZ$; appending this derivation we deduce $\vdash_L QQZ = (Z \supset Q) \supset Q$.

Up until this point, $Q \in L$ has been arbitrary; we now take Q to be Z itself, in which case MP combines the foregoing deduction $\vdash_L (Z \supset Z) \supset Z$ with the instance $\vdash_L [(Z \supset Z) \supset Z] \supset Z$ of ($\mathbb{P}$) to yield $\vdash_L Z$. □

REFERENCES

[1] A. Church, *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, Princeton University Press (1956).

[2] J. W. Robbin, *Mathematical Logic - A First Course*, W.A. Benjamin (1969); Dover Publications (2006).

[3] P. L. Robinson, *Q-tableaux for Implicational Propositional Calculus*, arXiv 1512.03525 (2015).

Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611 USA
E-mail address: paulr@ufl.edu